

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

The Office has rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,877,097 to Hamid et al. (Hamid) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,068,383 to Bello et al. (Bello). The Office asserts that Hamid discloses a system (Fig. 3-6) comprising: an access code system that embeds (e.g. encoded) at least one access code (e.g., authorization code) , the device having multiple features (see abstract, fig. 6, claims 5-7) wherein each embedded code is matched to the device code, wherein each embedded code is matched with an access code stored in memory and wherein the authorization of the particular subset of a plurality of device features occurs if each identified access code embedded matches each stored access code for a particular operation and wherein each stored access code correlates to enabling the particular subset of a /plurality of device features (reads on fig 5 and claims 1-3, which describe how an access code(s) is/are matched with the plurality of functions). The Office acknowledges that Hamid fails to teach implementing the security access to a job stream of a particular job. Rather, the Office asserts that Bello et al. (in the same field of endeavor “encoding information”) teaches that it is well known in the art at the time of the invention to embed encoded information in a job stream of a particular job to be printer (e.g. abstract and col. 3, lines 4-13), and therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the security access system having an access code for different (or subset) functions of a device as taught by Hamid et al. into the embedded job stream of a particular job to provide access to the device as taught by Bello et al. allegedly because of the following reasons: (1) will allow the security access method of Hamid et al. to be implemented into a device being able to process print job and controlling the different feature of a device (such as the printer) as taught by Bello et al.; (2) by the combination the user(s) of Bello et al. can be assigned access control to the different functions of the features of the printer of Bello et al.; and (3) by implementing the security features as taught by Hamid et al. into the system of Bello et al. will allow the printer of Bello et al. to received access codes from the host and control access to the different features of the printer. With respect to claims 14, 20, and 26, the Office asserts that the limitations of claim 14 are covered by the limitations of claim 1 above; and Bello et al. further teaches the feature of parsing system that parses a job stream to find at least one embedded access code (see fig. 5), clearly the system as suggested above will use

the parser of Bello et al. to detect the access code, and as it was suggested above the security access will be provided to the system of the Bello et al. to control access to the printer).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Hamid and Bello, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest “an access code system that embeds at least one access code in a job stream, each embedded code authorizing access to a particular subset of a plurality of device features, but not to other device features of the device,” as recited by claim 1, or “embedding at least one access code in a job stream, each embedded code authorizing access to a particular subset of a plurality of device features, but not to other device features of the device,” as recited by claims 6 and 10.

As noted above, the Office acknowledges that Hamid fails to teach embedding the security access code in a job stream of a particular job. Additionally, as also noted above, Bello is being relied upon by the Office to disclose embedding encoded information in a job stream of a particular job to be printer for which the Office cites to Bello’s Abstract and col. 3, lines 4-13. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office’s assertions regarding Bello. Bello at most mentions that a document is a “single bounded stream of data” (Abstract), but does not disclose that the document contains an “embedded access code,” as recited by claims 1, 6, and 10. In the portions of Bello cited by the Office, at col. 3, lines 4-13, Bello describes a Smart Front End 104 integrated on the front device. That is, Bello is describing a **front end/interface embedded in the print device software on the print device** (col. 3, lines 4-6), and which is contrastingly different from the Applicants’ claimed **access code embedded in a job stream**. Bello’s Smart Front End 104 operates on a data stream that has already reached a printing device. Indeed, the Office has mischaracterized the integration of this Smart Front End 104 to be the same as the Applicants’ claimed embedding of the access code. Thus, Bello fails to resolve the deficiencies of Hamid, as argued above with respect to claims 1, 6, and 10.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 6, and 10. Since claims 2-5 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 1, claims 7-9 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 6, and claims 11-13 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 10, they are distinguishable over the cited references and patentable in the same manner as claims 1, 6, and 10.

With respect to claims 14, 20 and 26, Hamid and Bello, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest “an access code identification system that identifies each embedded access code matching a stored access code, each stored access code permitting access to a particular subset of a plurality of device features but not to other features of a device,” as recited by claim 14, or “identifying each embedded access code that matches a stored access code, each embedded code permitting access to a particular subset of a plurality of device features, but not to other device features of the device,” as recited by claims 20 and 26.

As noted above, the Office asserts that in addition to the limitations of claim 14 allegedly covered by claim 1 above, Bello further discloses that the feature of a parsing system that parses a job stream to find at least one access code and cites to FIG. 5. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office’s assertions. In FIG. 5, Bello at most discloses a query parser 500 which detects a query in the client data and routes the query to be answered by an answer module 506 located in a query module 502 (col. 4, lines 38-46). However, such a query is not the claimed embedded access code which is identified, as claimed. In fact, there is simply no disclosure in Bello that such a query parser, or any other component of Bello, discloses finding at least one access code, as claimed by the Applicants, and as described, for example, in paragraph [0035] of the original filed specification. Therefore, in addition to the arguments presented above with respect to claims 1, 6, and 10 for similar features, Hamid and Bello, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the above-noted distinguishing features of claims 14, 20, and 26, and thus do not render claims 14, 20, and 26 unpatentable.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 14, 20, and 26. Since claims 15-19 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 14, claims 21-25 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 20, and claims 27-31 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 26, they are distinguishable over the cited references and patentable in the same manner as claims 14, 20, and 26.

An advantage of the Applicants’ claimed invention is that without requiring specialized programming skills, selective access to particular device features can be provided using access codes that are easily programmed and/or updated (*see*, for example, Table I in

Applicant's original filed specification). None of the cited references disclose such unique features or attain these unique advantages as the Applicants' claimed invention does.

Therefore, in view of all of the foregoing, applicant submits that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 9, 2009

/Gunnar G. Leinberg/
Gunnar G. Leinberg
Registration No.: 35,584

NIXON PEABODY LLP
1100 Clinton Square
Rochester, New York 14604
Telephone: (585) 263-1014
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600